DR. MODI MEMORIAL VOLUME

PAPERS ON INDO-IRANIAN AND OTHER SUBJECTS

WRITTEN BY

SEVERAL SCHOLARS

IN HONOUR OF

Shams-ul-Ulama Dr. Jivanji Jamshedji Modi, B.A., Ph.D., C.I.E., J.P.

EDITED BY

The Dr. Modi Memorial Volume Editorial Board

BOMBAY

PRINTED AT THE FORT PRINTING PRESS.

1930

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS

PAGE

Prof. Wilhelm Geiger's Letter - - - - - - - xi

Foreword - - - - - - - - - - - - - v

Persian Verses in Praise of Shams-ul-Ulama Dr. Jivanji Jamshedji Modi. By Ervad Mahiar Navroji Kutar and Ervad Faramarz Navroji Kutar - - - - - - - - - 1

Ahuna Vairya. By Khodabax Edalji Punegar, B.A. - - 7

Aryan Origins. By Prof. Ernest P. Horrwitz - - - 16

Sanskrit Shlokas in the Chânda Prakâsha on Zoroastrian Calendar. By Shapurji Kavasji Hodivala, B.A. - - - 22

On an Allusion to Mâni in Dênkart 9.39. 13-16. By Prof. A. V. Williams Jackson - - - - - - - - - - 34

Pahlavi 𐭯𐭲𐭩𐭫𐭮𐭩 or 𐭯𐭲𐭩𐭪𐭮—*Dastkart*. By Bamanji Nasarvanji Dhabhar, M.A. - - - - - - - - - - - 37

An Ancient Persian House—The Kings of Pontus. By C. A. Kincaid, C.V.O., I.C.S. (Retd.) - - - - - - - 45

The Nimbus-crowned figure at Tâk-i Bostân. By Dastur Dr. Maneckji Nusserwanji Dhalla, A.M., PH.D. - - - - 61

The Early Home of Sanskrit. By Prof. A. H. Sayce - - 68

The Spirants in Avestan. By R. P. Dewhurst, M.A. (OXON.), I.C.S. (Retd.) - - - - - - - - - - - 73

Mitanni, Iran and India. By Dr. A. Berriedale Keith - - 81

The Celebration and Gifts of the Persian New Year (Nawrûz) according to an Arabic Source. Translated from the Arabic by R. Ehrlich - - - - - - - - - - - 95

The 1468 Years of the World-Conflagration in Manichæism. By Dr. Charles J. Ogden, PH.D. - - - - - - - 102

Was Zarathushtra, the Prophet of the Parsis, a Freemason? By Jehangir Barjorji Sanjana, B.A., P.M. - - - - 106

The Daryâî Nôrôz. By M. P. Khareghat, I.C.S. (Retd.) - - 118

On the Seven Climata of the World. By Dr. J. M. Unvala, PH.D. 131

Formal Peace-Negotiations and Peace-Treaties between Pre-Muhammadan Persia and other States. By Prof. Louis H. Gray, M.A., PH.D. - - - - - - - - - - 136

Digitized by Google

PAGE.

Naturam Expellas Furcā. By Dr. Mrs. Rhys Davids, D.LITT., M.A. - - - - - - - - - - - 154

Some Cults and Legends of Ancient Persia and China. By Sir J. C. Coyajee, KT. - - - - - - - - - - 161

Vishtāspa. By Prof. Ernst Herzfeld - - - - - - 182

Parsis and Fire-Worship. By Mehrjibhai Nosherwanji Kuka, M.A. - - - - - - - - - - - - - 206

A Persian Marriage Custom. By R. E. Enthoven, C.I.E., I.C.S. (Retd.) - - - - - - - - - - - 212

The Spenta Mainyu in the Gathas—The Source of Fravashis in the Avesta and of the Logos in Christianity. By Sorabji Nowroji Kanga, B.A. - - - - - - - - - - 214

The Name of the River Hilmend. By Dr. Wilhelm Geiger - 240

Episodes kindred to "Rustam and Sohrab" in Epic Literature. By Prof. Firoze Cowasji Davar, M.A., LL.B. - - - - 244

History of the Leading Nobles of the Kingdom of Bijapur, 1627-1686. By Sir Jadunath Sarkar, KT., C.I.E., M.A. - 251

Some Corresponding Conceptions in Old India and Iran. By Dr. Herman Lommel, PH.D. - - - - - - - - 260

Some Salt Pans in Gujarat during Mogul Times. By Diwan Bahadur Krishnalal M. Jhaveri, M.A., LL.B., J.P. - - - 273

The Question of Zoroastrian Influence on Early Buddhism. By Dr. Edward J. Thomas, M.A., D.LITT. - - - - - 279

Yasna Hā XXVIII. By Dr. Irach Jehangir Sorabji Taraporewala, B.A., PH.D., BAR.-AT-LAW - - - - - - - 290

A Note on the Shabara-Bhāṣya. By Dr. Ganganatha Jha - 311

An Anglo-Saxon Charm. By G. E. L. Carter, I.C.S. - - 313

Two Versions of the History of Mazdak. By Arthur Christensen - - - - - - - - - - - - - 321

Authorship of the Pṛthvīrājavijayam. By Dr. S. K. Belvalkar, M.A., PH.D., I.E.S. - - - - - - - - - - - 331

Average Word-Length in Sanskrit. By Prof. A. C. Woolner - 338

Early Persian Poetry and its Relation to Arabic Poetry. By Dr. U. M. Daudpota, M.A. (BOM.), PH.D. (CANTAB.), M.R.A.S. - - - - - - - - - - - - 341

The Pahlavas and Pārasīkas in Ancient Sanskrit Literature. By P. V. Kane, M.A., LL.M. - - - - - - - - - 352

Digitized by Google

PAGE

The Renaissance of Persian Poetry. By D. J. Irani, B.A., LL.B., SOLICITOR - - - - - - - - - - - - 358

پس از ساسانیان. By A. Spenta - - - - - - - - 375

The Origin of the Alphabet. By Sohrab Jamshedjee Balsara, M.A. - - - - - - - - - - - - - 378

Parsiism and Hinduism. By S. S. Mehta, B.A. - - - 405

The Sogdian Word for 'To Read'. By Hans Reichelt - - 412

Asha in the Gāthās of the Avesta and Ṛta in the Ṛgveda. By Rev. Dr. R. Zimmermann, S.J., PH.D. - - - - - - 414

گئوتم. By Aga Poure-Davoud - - - - - - - - 424

Confession of Sins in Zoroastrian Religion. By Prof. R. Pettazzoni - - - - - - - - - - - - 437

La Pesée de l'éléphant. By Dr. Sylvain Levi - - - - 442

Aśokan Notes. By Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar - - - - 445

The Mhera. By Vishvanath P. Vaidya, B.A., BAR.-AT-LAW - 451

Nails among the Jews and the Parsees. By Prof. Ezekiel Moses Ezekiel, B.A., LL.B., J.P. - - - - - - - 459

The Origin of the Idea of a Universal Saviour. By Dr. O. Pertold, PH.D. - - - - - - - - - - - 465

Sur Vendidād VII, 24, et V, 12. By Prof. A. Meillet - - 475

A Pahlavi Text on Communism. By Dr. Jehangir C. Tavadia, B.A., PH.D. - - - - - - - - - - - - 479

The Winged Disk and the Winged Human Figure on Ancient Persian Monuments. By Dr. J. M. Unvala, PH.D. - - 488

Ethnographical Problems of the History of India. By Francis Zajti, LIC.DIV. - - - - - - - - - - - 514

William Erskine's Dissertation on the Religion, Usages and Morals of the Parsis. By R. P. Masani, M.A. - - - 526

The Gathas and the Avesta. By Ervad M. P. Madan - - 547

Les Diminutifs Persans en -ō. By E. Benveniste - - - 556

Relations between India and Babylonia in Early Times. By Prof. A. H. Sayce - - - - - - - - - - 559

Arjunamiśra. By Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, PH.D. - - - 565

Indianization of Greek Philosophy. By Dr. Balkrishna, M.A., PH.D. - - - - - - - - - - - - 569

Digitized by Google

PAGE

Yasna 53. By H. W. Bailey - - - - - - - - 578

ایران را چرا باید دوست داشت. By M. A. Forooghi - - - 595

Zarathushtra and the Ahunavairya Prayer. By Dastur Cursetji Erachji Pavry - - - - - - - - - - 603

Indo-Iranian Ideas of Impurity. By Principal Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya - - - - - - - - - - - 610

The Law of Contracts in Ancient Iran. By J. C. Tarapore, M.A., LL.B. - - - - - - - - - - - - 615

The Unpublished Translation of the Upanishads by Prince Dara Shikoh. By Mahesh Prasad - - - - - - 622

The Value of Persian Literature. By Otto Rothfield, B.A. (OXON.) 639

Foreign Materials for the Historical Geography of Asia from the Most Ancient Times to the 15th Century. By J. A. Saldanha, B.A., LL.B. - - - - - - - - - - 660

The-Old Persian Inscriptions. By F. H. Weissbach. Translated from German by Rev. Dr. D. Mackichan - - - 673

Zur Frage über die berufung Mohammed's. By W. Barthold - 706

Das Naurōz—seine geschichte und seine bedeutung. By Prof. Dr. Jos. Markwart - - - - - - - - - - 709

The Origin of the Avestan Alphabet. ByProf. Hch. F. J. Jünker- 766

Digitized by Google

THE EARLY HOME OF SANSKRIT.

By Prof. A. H. Sayce.

During the last few years archæological discovery has thrown new and unexpected light on the earlier history of India. Historians had become accustomed to regard India in the age before Asoka or Alexander the Great as a world in itself, unconnected with the other countries of the civilised globe. It was, indeed, grudgingly admitted that there might have been some trading transactions between Arabia or Babylonia and the Western coast of India; the name of the Babylonian *maṇeh* had been found in the Ṛig-Veda, and Tamil etymologies for the sandal-wood and apes brought to Palestine by the fleet of Solomon had been proposed. But when, many years ago (1887), in my Hibbert Lectures I suggested that cotton may have been introduced into Babylonia from India at a comparatively early date and pointed in support of this to the teak-wood discovered by Taylor on the site of Ur, the suggestion was received with scepticism and silence.

Scepticism and silence, however, are no longer possible. The discoveries recently made at Harappa and Mohenjo-daro have shown that as far back as the third millennium B.C. there were trading and cultural relations between North-Western India on the one side and Elam and Babylonia on the other. Indian seals and script found their way to the West and the Copper and Bronze Age civilisation of the West found its way to the banks of the Indus.

But North-Western India had not yet been Aryanised. We have to wait a few centuries longer before the light dawns upon the India of the Veda. And the light comes from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor. The cuneiform tablets of Mitanni or Mesopotamia and of the Hittite capital at

Digitized by Google

Boghaz-keui in Asia Minor are restoring for us the earlier history of those regions of Western Asia and therewith of the authors of the hymns of the Ṛig-Veda.

One of the letters in the famous correspondence preserved in the ruins of the ancient Egyptian Foreign Office at Tel el-Amarna is a long letter to the Pharaoh in his native language from the Mitannian King Dusratta (B.C. 1380). The Mitannian language belonged to the so-called agglutinative group and was allied to languages spoken in Asia Minor and the Caucasus, and is still very imperfectly known. But the letter of Dusratta contains certain information the importance of which has long been recognised by philologists. We learn from it that along with the chief native and Babylonian divinities three other deities were worshipped in Mitanni who bore the distinctly Sanskritic names of Varuna, Indra and Nāsatya. Only one conclusion can be drawn from this: there must have been an element in the population of Mitanni which spoke Vedic Sanskrit.

The Hittite tablets of Boghaz-keui have now confirmed this conclusion. Among them are portions of a work on the breeding and training of horses by a Mitannian writer named Kikuli whose work was translated into Hittite. It contains a number of technical words used by the horse-breeders, and these words, which include several of the numerals, are all purely Sanskrit. As the highlands of Asia Minor rather than the Mesopotamian plain were the breeding place of the horses which were exported in large numbers to all parts of the Western civilised world, it follows that there was a population in them which spoke—not Iranian or some hitherto unknown Indo-European dialect—but the Sanskrit of the Veda. In other words, in the 15th and 14th centuries B.C. what we call Sanskrit was spoken in Asia Minor and Mesopotamia.

The inferences to be drawn from these facts are obvious. In the first place the Aryans who first occupied

Digitized by Google

North-Western India have never spoken a mixed Indo-Iranian tongue. They were separate from the Iranians on the philological side; as far as they were concerned there was only one form of Indo-European speech in use among them from Asia Minor in the west to the Punjab in the east. Before they had left their homes in Asia Minor and Mesopotamia the language of India had been already formed.

Then, secondly, Sanskrit was spoken in Asia Minor side by side with other Indo-European languages or dialects one of which would have been Old Phrygian, while in another we may see a primitive form of Greek. Asia Minor, in fact, the land-bridge between Europe and Asia, would have been the country in which the leading Indo-European languages once developed side by side; whether it was the home of the Parent-Speech is another question in regard to which we have at present no evidence; all that is clear is that it was there that most of its chief descendants assumed or already represented their later forms.

The official language of the Hittite Empire, commonly known as Hittite but called "the Language of the Scribes" by the Hittites themselves, is now partially deciphered, thanks to the multitudinous cuneiform tablets discovered at Boghaz-keui, and is an important element in the question. The language is an extremely mixed one; in the ancient world it corresponds with English in the modern world. There is a large borrowed Assyro-Babylonian element in its grammar and vocabulary and a still larger Indo-European element; indeed a considerable number of scholars maintain that the Indo-European element is the original one, the Asianic element being due to borrowing like the Assyrian element. This view I am unable to share; the structure of the language is Asianic and though the grammar is in many respects strikingly Indo-European it is not more so than English grammar is Romanic. And the vocabulary is far less Indo-European than the English vocabulary is

Digitized by Google

non-Teutonic. The matter is further complicated by the fact that, as in the case of the modern Caucasian languages, Indo-European and Asianic languages existed side by side in Asia Minor, influencing and borrowing one from the other and giving free play to the results of assimilation and analogy. If Hittite grammar borrowed from Indo-European, Indo-European grammar on the other hand borrowed from Hittite. The use of the verbal suffix *-r* is, I believe, one of the instances in which Hittite influence can be detected in Indo-European speech, and in view of the *-bi* and *-t* of the Vannic first and third persons, not to speak of the Semitic second person singular and plural (*-ti*, *-tin*), it is a question whether what have hitherto appeared to be among the most certain examples of Indo-European suffixes may not, after all, have primarily been of foreign origin. Modern science has taught us how largely mixed are and have been the races of the civilised and even uncivilised world; future research is likely to show that there has been an equal amount of mixture in its languages. A "pure" language does not exist any more than a pure race.

How large a number of words in the Greek vocabulary has been borrowed from the languages of Asia Minor is fully recognised; indeed Professor Calder once remarked to me that he believed two-thirds of it came from an Asianic source. There was also a large "Danubian" element in Greek the extent of which, however, must remain unknown as long as written memorials of the "Danubian" language are undiscovered. In Latin, too, the Asianic element can be traced in both the grammar and the vocabulary, but here Etruscan influence has complicated the problem and made it difficult to determine what is due to this influence and what to early contact between Asia Minor and the "Parent" of the Italian dialects.

The discovery that Sanskrit was once spoken in Asia Minor makes it no longer possible to regard the

Digitized by Google

presence or absence of a Sanskrit "root" as a test of the Indo-European origin of a word. Just as the primitive speakers of Greek or Latin could have borrowed a word or grammatical form from Hittite or some other language of Asia Minor, so too could the Western speakers of Vedic Sanskrit. Some other criterion is needed before we can be sure to which group, Asianic or Indo-European, a particular word or suffix originally belonged, whether it implies borrowing or derivation from a common Parent-Speech, or whether in the form in which it has reached us it is due to assimilation.

In the case of Hittite, an older form of the language has fortunately been preserved. This was called Luian by the Hittite scribes and is far less intermixed than the official Hittite with words borrowed from Indo-European or Assyrian. It has also retained some of the older forms of the grammatical suffixes; thus in the nominative singular and accusative plural of the noun we find *-nza* and *-nzi* (*-ntz*) instead of the official Hittite *-s* (Vannic *-s*); the relative pronoun *kuis*, for instance, appears as *kuinzi*, GUD-*as* "oxen" as GUD-*inza*. So again, *-khiti* takes the place of the official Hittite abstract suffix *-tar*, though we also find *-tar* in Luian but used as a plural (*e.g.* AN-*Lulakh-inzastar* "the Lulakhi gods"). Luian, it may be added, was the language of Eastern Cilicia and was adopted by the Hittites (whose original language was "Proto-Hittite") after their occupation of Khattusas, the modern Boghaz-keui.

Digitized by Google

MITANNI, IRAN AND INDIA

By Dr. A. Berriedale Keith.

We owe to Walter Porzig[1] an interesting effort to prove that in the region of the kingdom of Mitanni, about 1400 B.C., the Aryans, not yet separated into Iranians and Indians, were living in close contiguity, and that during this period, prior to their exclusion from the western Asiatic culture by the catastrophe of Mitanni, about 1350 B.C., they were subjected to the influence of that culture. His thesis is in some degree novel, especially in as much as it insists on the fact that the Aryans in Mitanni are not to be regarded as an outlying colony, far distant from the great body of Aryans, and in any case the new evidence adduced merits careful consideration.

Dr. Porzig has no doubt on one fundamental issue; he is certain that the evidence from Mitanni is conclusive that the Aryans were not yet divided, negating the doctrine often now asserted that the Indo-Europeans of Mitanni were specifically Indians.[2] Names like Subandu negate the view that they were Iranians, but such a name as Tušratta is equally, on his view, conclusive against their being Indians; this name, on his view, must be equated with Dužatha, from *dus-ratha*, and in Indian this would give Dūratha. Again, what are in India palatals seem still to have been affricates, to judge from the numeral *panza* in the famous treatise on horses,[3] which is Indian *pañca*. In any case it is reasonable to hold that, as the cuneiform script does not distinguish between tenues and

1 ZII. v. 265-80. I follow his transcriptions, but Babylonian *š* should rather be written *s* as in Assyrian pronunciation; Meyer, SBA. 1925, p. 244, n. 1.

2 So now E. Meyer, SBA. 1925, p. 252; Kretschmer, WZKM. xxxiii. 7-9.

3 Written in non-Indo-European Hittite by Kikkuli; see Jensen, SBA. 1919, p. 367 ff.; Forrer, ZDMG. lxxvi. 252 ff.

Digitized by Google

mediæ, we may legitimately seek to explain *z* in some names as the representative of Indian *j*. Thus the obscure name Mattiuza or Mattiwaza may be equated with Mati-vāja, "whose victorious power consists of prayer", a combination of ideas from the racecourse and religion which is doubtless not alien to Vedic ideas. The same *vāja* is to be found in the name of a ruler of Ube, north of Damaskus, Namiawaza, which is to be understood as Namya-vāja, "whose victorious power is worthy of honour". These forms, however, are not merely Indian, but also Aryan, and as Aryan again we are to understand the names which have been considered specifically Iranian, because they show *ar* where Indian has *ṛ*, and where Aryan also would properly show *ṛ*. The *ar* is to be set down to "Lautsubstitution", and the names Artamania, Artaššumara[1], and Artatama or Artataama, are to be read as Aryan Ṛtamanya, "he who strives after the Right", Ṛtasmara, "he who thinks of the Right", and Ṛtadhāman, "he whose abode is the Right". On the other hand, when not initial, as in these cases, *ṛ* is presented in the cuneiform script as *iri*; thus Biridašva, the name of a Syrian prince, is to be rendered as Pṛdašva, "possessing war horses".

In the view that the speech revealed by the Mitanni and other records is Aryan, I entirely concur[2]; it has always appeared to me the most plausible view, and alone explains why we have forms which suggest Iranian side by side with those which look Indian. The Mitanni *aika*, "one", illustrates well the view that the language is Aryan. But this does not mean that as late as 1400 B.C., the Aryans formed a homogeneous group with one speech; very probably they were already scattered over a considerable area, and the differences which are so marked in

1 The name is also read Artašuwara; *cf.* Vedic *suvar*. See also Kretschmer, WZKM. xxxiii. 7.

2 *Cf.* my article in the *Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume*, pp. 81-92; *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, ii. 617.

Digitized by Google

Iranian and Indian may have been in course of development.[1] This fact alone accounts for the apparent occurrence of specifically Indian and Iranian forms; we may assume the development of dialects within the Aryan community, and the usual phenomenon of loan words in one dialect from another and isoglosses with different areas. This accounts for the fact that the numerals have distinctly a more Indian appearance, while the forms in *ar*, if initial, and *iri*, if medial, look distinctly Iranian. It must be added that it is not possible to accept with certainty all of Dr. Porzig's comparisons. The explanation of *waza* by *vāja* is specious, but both the compounds suggested, Mativāja and Namyavāja, are a little strange; Dušratta has been traced to other sources,[2] *e.g.*, *daśaratha*, "having ten chariots" or *dus-raddha*, "hard to overcome", and dogmatism on the word is impossible. Nor is it certain that Artaššumara can really be made equal to Artasmara, still less that Artatama is Artadhāman. On the whole, therefore, we can hardly accept as established Dr. Porzig's theory that the Aryans were in 1400 B.C. undifferentiated and living closely together. Rather must we admit that, while they were not yet sharply severed into Iranian and Indian, processes of differentiation were at work, and there is no proof of close proximity.

Dr. Porzig, however, relies on his new evidence to prove that the Aryans when together borrowed words and ideas alike from peoples of Western Asia, to whom, on the other hand, they contributed the use of the horse and the war chariot. He recognises the difficulty of proving such borrowings, but relies on the fact that at the beginning of the first millennium B.C. the Aryans were cut off

1 Note the numeral *satta*, a form of Prākritic appearance, and the names of princes of Kommagene, Kundaspi (854 B.C.) and Kustaspi (740 B.C.), which have the Middle Persian change of *vi* to *gu*.

2 See Kretschmer, WZKM. xxxiii. 7; Scheftelowitz, KZ. xxxviii. 270.

Digitized by Google

from Asia Minor and the Aegean coast lands by the great kingdoms of Urarṭu in the north and Assyria in the south. It is, therefore, proper to seek in Vedic Indian for loan words from Asia Minor; if these are found, they can fairly be ascribed to the Aryan period when the Aryans lived in close proximity to Mitanni. It is admitted, very justly, that the task of finding such terms offers great difficulties, in view of the wholly inadequate knowledge which we possess of the speeches of Asia Minor in the period in question. There are, of course, many words in Greek which are justly suspect of Asiatic provenance,[1] and the presence of a corresponding term in Indian can often be used to indicate that the word really comes from Asia Minor. But even then it is necessary to remember that the word may have been borrowed not by the Aryans, but by the Indo-Germans, or that it may simply have come to India from Greece; of the latter class, we have of course the striking example[2] of the Sanskrit *surungā* which is due to Greek *syrinx* and it again to Asia Minor. Dr. Porzig, nonetheless, thinks that the difficulties which he sets out can be overcome; a loan word in Indo-European times will follow the normal rules of sound change; if, therefore, the forms in Greek and Indian are abnormal, then the loan does not go back to Indo-European date; the second difficulty must be dealt with on the basis of considerations of change of meaning and relative chronology. These suggestions are, clearly, sound in principle, and the only question is whether they can be applied with sufficient security of achieving a definite result.

It is here that Dr. Porzig's results are not altogether convincing. His first comparison is that of Greek *erebinthos* with Sanskrit *aravinda*. The divergence of meaning between "chickpease" and "lotus" he explains by insisting that both are vitally connected with the idea of birth and growth;

1 See Meillet, *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque* (1920), pp. 39 ff.

2 See O. Stein, ZII. iii. 280 ff.

Digitized by Google

the word was borrowed as associated with a religious conception. It is unnecessary to enquire whether the comparison of the two terms is really sound; for the immediate purpose it is necessary to point out that there is no evidence of the term *aravinda* being known in India before the time of Pāṇini,[1] and as Pāṇini has the term Yavanāni, "Ionian", terms not known earlier than his work may easily be late loan words. The fact is important, because on this comparison Dr. Porzig bases a very interesting argument to the effect that in loan words from Asia Minor we have Greek *th* corresponding to Indian *d*, and this conclusion is the foundation for his theory that in Greek *narthēx* and Indian *naḍa*, presumably for *narda*,[2] we have another case of a loan word from Asia Minor, and not an Indo-European word. But, dismissing the comparison of *erebinthos* and *aravinda* as of any value for 1400 B.C., we have nothing to support the theory of a loan word, even assuming the correctness of the comparison. Dr. Porzig lays stress on the termination *ax* as non-Indo-European, but, in the first place, this is not proved, and secondly, as he very properly admits, it is found appended to perfectly clear Indo-European bases such as the base of *leimax*. It is, therefore, most improbable that we can lend any credence to the next of the comparisons suggested, that of Greek *thal* with Sanskrit *dal*. Both roots, on this view, mean primarily "to swell" or "bud" of plants, whence by an easy transfer of meaning we arrive at Greek *thalamos*, "bridal chamber". The Asiatic origin of the root is asserted, because on the Etruscan mirror[3] whereon is depicted the birth of Athene the Eileithuiai, who assist at the birth, are styled Thalna. But it must be objected at once that the claim that *dal* has the sense "to bud", as its original meaning, is unwarranted. The root is not an early one,

1 It occurs only in the *Gaṇapāṭha* in some editions and doubtless was not known to Pāṇini.

2 See Wackernagel, *Altind. Gramm.*, I. i. 169.

3 See *Glotta*, xiii. 146 ff.; Kretschmer, *ibid.* xiv. 319 f.

Digitized by Google

and it is historically clear that it is connected with *dṛ*, and that the prime sense is rather "to split", so that comparison with Greek *daidallo* is not contrary to probability on semasiological grounds. Yet another comparison in which Greek *th* is held to correspond to Indian *d*, and to attest a loan word, is adduced in the comparison of Greek Thargelia, held to have been originally a festival connected with wine, and Sanskrit *drākṣā*; in this case again, without adducing other difficulties, it suffices to point out that *drākṣā* is a late Sanskrit, not a Vedic term, and therefore is useless in this connection.

The same question of dates renders of no value the comparison of Greek *karpasos*, which denotes a fine material, with Sanskrit *karpāsa*, "cotton tree" or "cotton". Both terms are found so late as to have no value as evidence for the second millennium B.C. It must be added that it is by no means clear whether the Greek word is borrowed from the Sanskrit as is usually asserted,[1] or *vice versa*. No value attaches to the argument that, as the Sanskrit term denotes the tree, and the Greek only a material, the borrowing must be by Greek, and Dr. Porzig is quite entitled to point to the possibility that *karpasos* may be connected with the name of the island Karpathos and the place name Karpasia recorded by Stephanos of Byzantium, both names possibly originally denoting a plant. The different quantity of the second syllable in the two words adds to the uncertainty of their comparison.

Outside the world of plants, whose importance in pre-Greek religion is admitted, Dr. Porzig ventures on the claim that in the Vedic word *kūpa*, denoting a pit, and in the gloss of Hesychios *kupē*, denoting a "hole", we have a word ultimately borrowed from Asia Minor, where it appears in Lycian as the designation, *kupa*, of the rock

1 Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* 415.

Digitized by Google

tombs. It is improbable, it is argued, that the Lycians would borrow[1] the name of so characteristic a feature of their civilisation, and so the term can hardly be an Indo-European loan word, while the general appearance of Lycian precludes the hypothesis that it is an Indo-European form of speech. But this mode of argument is not conclusive; we know far too little to be able to say that the Lycians may not have borrowed the word, even if we refuse to regard the similarity as merely accidental like that between Potamos in Greece and Potomac in America. On the other hand Dr. Porzig is forced to separate *kūpa* from its obvious kindred words[2] Latin *cupa*, Old English *hyf*, Old Icelandic *hufr*, a procedure which is clearly illegitimate.

In the face of these negative results it is impossible to accept the last suggestion of Dr. Porzig, namely, that a *-bho-* suffix in animal names is derived from Asia Minor. Admittedly there is an Indo-European suffix *-bho-* which may well be connected with *bhī*, "shine", and which occurs in words denoting colour; whether the *-bho-* suffix in animal names (Greek *elaphos*, Sanskrit *gardabha*) is merely a variant of that suffix may be disputed, but that it is Indo-European seems perfectly clear.[3] Moreover the authority for the existence of such a suffix in Asia Minor adduced by Dr. Porzig is clearly inadequate. The Nomos inscription of Praisos[4], one of the Eteocretan records, appears to have a word with the suffix *-pha*, and a Greek inscription[5] found between Kandia and Praisos hails the god Hermes as Kupharissipha, "of the cypress". To deduce hence an

1 But Hommel (*Ethnologie und Geographie des alten Orients*, p. 995) suggests that Lycian *keatro*, 'daughter', is borrowed from Indo-European.

2 Walde, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der lateinischen Sprache*, 213.

3 Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergl. Gramm. der indogerm. Sprachen*, II. i. 386 ff.

4 Conway, *Ann. Brit. School Athens*, viii. 125 ff.

5 *Hermes*, 1901, pp. 452 ff.

Digitized by Google

Asiatic suffix denoting connection seems to go far beyond the region of probability.

It appears to me, therefore, that we cannot ascribe to Asia Minor influence in the period of the Mitanni kingdom that effect on the speech of the Aryans which Dr. Porzig claims. It is, accordingly, not surprising that his arguments as to cultural influence are still less convincing. Śiva, he points out, has a decidedly strange appearance to minds accustomed to Indo-European gods, and he rejects the normal view of influence on the Vedic Indians by the earlier people of India, and suggests instead that Śiva is essentially identical with the god of Asia Minor who in Mitanni is known as Teŝup, and who is throned above the mountain summits, and is depicted standing on a bull and bearing in his hand the lightning, just as Śiva is a mountain god, who rides a bull, and whose emblem is the trident, notoriously the iconic representation of the lightning. So too his spouse, Pārvatī or Durgā, is none other than the great goddess of Asia Minor, Hepa in Mitanni. The theory is open to the fatal objection that Śiva can perfectly well be explained from Indo-European and Indian influences, and that Pārvatī also is perfectly at home in India, and does not need to be explained by any borrowing from Asia Minor[1]. More interesting is the suggestion that it was in Mitanni that the Aryans learned to apply writing to their language, with the result that ultimately they evolved in India the syllabic Brāhmī script with its indication of the different vowel sounds other than short *a*. The only proof, however, of this thesis suggested is the fact that in the cuneiform of Mitanni cases are known in which syllable signs, which can be read with different vowels, are made precise by the addition of the vowel sign. This is interesting, but there is no reason whatever, as matters stand, to see any connection between the work of the framers of

1 Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, i. 144 ff.

Digitized by Google

the Brāhmī alphabet and the very slight advance in the same direction which is adduced from Mitanni.

The net result, accordingly, of the whole consideration of the problem appears to be that there is not sufficient ground to picture the Aryans as a compact mass in the neighbourhood of Mitanni. That view has been supported indeed by Dr. Forrer[1] who has revived the suggestion that the Aryans came from over the Kaukasus, and that proto-Indians long dwelt in eastern Armenia on the Kaspian Sea preparatory to movements to the south east and the east. I agree with Professor E. Meyer[2] that there is no probability in this view. The Aryan element in Mitanni probably consisted merely of warrior bands who secured for a period overlordship, but, scanty in numbers, were soon absorbed into the settled population of the land. The rejection of Dr. Porzig's views is of importance for the date of the advent in India. To him the period is not before some time after 1350 B.C., but this view is difficult to reconcile with the probable date of the *Ṛgveda*, which even in its oldest hymns seems to contemplate a substantial period of occupation of Indian territory. Paul Kretschmer[3] admits that there is no evidence to suggest that there was any large number of Indians in the neighbourhood of Mitanni about 1400 B.C.

On these considerations is based a theory of some complexity. The Aryans knew a god Asura, whose name is Aryan but whose nature is Assyro-Babylonian and who is in essence Assur, the god of Assyria. Apparently still in Aryan times this great god was connected, under the influence of the Babylonian Sin and Šamaš, with Mitra, originally an abstract god, the personification of the power of treaty compacts. In this combination the Aryans per-

1 SBA. 1919, p. 1036; ZDMG. lxxvi. 247; OLZ. 1924, pp. 113-18.

2 SBA. 1925, p. 254.

3 WZKM. xxxiii. 22. Konow (*Festgabe Jacobi*, p. 261) contemplates Indians in the Indus valley about 300 OB.C., but this seems very improbable.

Digitized by Google

haps did not distinguish clearly between the form of light represented by either god; later admittedly Mitra was a sun god.

The Indian branch of the Aryans developed their religious views in a twofold direction. One branch accepted the Hittite Arunas, the sea god, and remained true to that conception of him; these are the ancestors of the Indians who in post Vedic literature know Varuṇa merely as a sea god, and whose existence is supported by traces in Middle Indian speeches of descent from dialects independent of the Vedic speech.[1] Another branch, on the other hand, amalgamated Aruṇa with Asura, the sea with the sky god, just as at Mylasa the Karians worshipped Osogos or Osogoa, whom the Greeks rendered as Zēnoposeidōn. These were the ancestors of the Vedic Indians. Those Indians who remained true to their borrowed deity Aruṇa, regarded as heretical those Indians who made Aruṇa an Asura, and this view triumphed in later Vedic times. The Iranians, on the other hand, so assimilated the Asura as to reject as demons their own Aryan Devas.

This elaborate scheme seems to have little to commend it. There is clearly a certain improbability in holding that the worshippers of a borrowed Aruṇa should resent so bitterly his contamination with the Asura, a deity which they also presumably inherited from the Aryan period, though Kretschmer's view on this point is not clear.[2] But further it is scarcely consistent to represent the Indians who kept intact Aruṇa as a sea god as standing apart from the Vedic Indians, and yet asserting that in later Vedic times their opposition to the Asura triumphed. Nor is it clear why we are to assume two distinct sets of Indians with different religious views to account for the

1 Wackernagel, *Altind. Gramm.*, i. p. xix.

2 It might be held that Asura affected the Iranians and a portion only of the Indians after differentiation, so that he was not an Aryan god, but this is not explicitly stated by Kretschmer, and may not be his view.

Digitized by Google

depression of the Asuras to demons; in the case of the Iranians no such supposition is adduced to explain why they reduced their Devas to low account, and there seems no reason to dispute the opinion which finds in a perfectly natural development within the Vedic religion itself the explanation of the changed estimation of the Asuras. Moreover the obvious view[1] that the Aryans had a sky god Varuṇa, who was credited with a moral character and so became the Lord, Asura, par excellence accounts admirably for all the facts.[2] It gives us the Vedic Varuṇa, the Asura, and in the great reform of Zarathushtra the god appears in the more abstract character of Ahura Mazdāh. That Varuṇa could in India itself decline to the rank of a lord of waters can be easily shown, and the existence of a Hittite god Arunas is, on the other hand, absolutely unproved. If indeed we really believed that the god involved in the treaty was properly styled Aruṇa, the obvious solution would be to render the word "ruddy", and to remember that in post Vedic Sanskrit the term denotes both the spirit which, as dawn, is harbinger of the sun, and the sun god himself. In view of Kretschmer's insistence on comparing Asura with Assur and Šamaš, it is perhaps strange that he rejects this view, as well as connection with Sanskrit *arṇava*. The suggestion that in the gods associated with Mitra and Aruṇa we are to see the stars is not pressed by the author and clearly is unconvincing.

More interesting is the suggestion, which can be considered quite apart from the conjectures as to religious borrowing, that it was owing to non-Indo-European race mixture that the Aryan speeches confuse *e* and *a*. The confusion of *o* and *a* stands on a different basis, being

1. Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, i. 100 ff.

2. It need not be denied that the Aryans may have been influenced in their conception of Varuṇa as King by the Mesopotamian royal power, but there is no certainty. The borrowing of the Nakṣatras is apparently late.

Digitized by Google

shared by the Aryans with the Letto-Slav, Illyrian, Albanian, and Germanic speeches, and presumably belongs to an earlier period of their history. The evidence suggested is the fact that in Indo-European words in Hittite we find *a* for Greek *e*; thus *adanzi* "they eat" corresponds to Greek and Indo-European *ed-*, *anda* to Greek *endon*, *assus* to *eus*, etc., and similarly Greek names are reproduced with *a* for *e*, as in Lazpas for Lesbos. Traces of the older pronunciation may be seen in the forms Ispabara of Ellip under Sargon, the Scythian king Ispaka under Assarhaddon, in place of the normal Avestan and Old Persian *aspa*, or Artapirna under Dareios II, with which contrasts Vinda-farnā. The suggestion is ingenious, but it must be considered in connection with Professor Max Walleser's interesting investigations[1] of the true value of the *a* of Sanskrit, which invite reopening of the whole of the accepted doctrines as to the merger of *o* and *e* in *a* in Aryan.

Professor Kretschmer, however, is, like Dr. Porzig, prepared to recognise the strong influence of Asiatic ideas on the Indians, and, without committing himself to Dr. Forrer's view of a European home for the Indo-Europeans, he pictures the ancestors of the Indians as dwelling in Mitanni ere they advanced *via* the Zagros mountains, where the term Šuriaš in the speech of the Kossaeans attests their influence, and Pura in Gedrosia,[2] to their Indian homes. This, of course, differs greatly from the view which has often been accepted that the Aryans in Mitanni represented merely the warrior bands who penetrated furthest west, and not the mass of the people. Professor Kretschmer's position rests on evidence which he finds, in agreement in part with B. Geiger[3] among others, of a very profound influence of the Hittites, Baby-

1 ZII. v. 193-202; *Zur Aussprache des Sanskrit und Tibetischen* (1926).

2 Arrian, *Anabasis*, vi. 24.

3 *Die Ameša Spentas*, pp. 139 ff.

Digitized by Google

lon, and Assyria on the Indians and the Iranians alike. His starting point is the conclusion that the gods invoked in the Mitanni version of Mattiuza's treaty with Subbiluliuma, as Mitraššil Arunaššil, mean "the gods who belong to (are associated with) Mitra and Aruṇa", the affix *ašši* being treated as denoting association, a contention which is by no means proved. The name Aruna in Subbiluliuma's text appears as Uruwana or Uruwna, and this form, and the normal Vedic form Varuṇa, are in Kretschmer's view cases of alteration of the original Aruna by popular etymology. It must, however, be noted that, if this is so, the etymology is not easy to suggest; Kretschmer varies between suggesting *-vana-* as a suffix, and connection with *van*, "desire". It is, therefore, impossible to avoid the impression that at the very first step in Kretschmer's investigation we have an improbability; the more obvious explanation of the divergence of the versions of the names is simply that both forms are imperfect reproductions of a foreign word, Varuṇa, and in point of fact admittedly the names of the gods are foreign words to the writers of the texts.

Arunas again is traced with Sommer[1] to the Hittite name of the sea, and we are invited to believe that the Indians borrowed from the Hittites a sea god. It must be pointed out that no evidence is adduced that the Hittites knew Arunas, as a sea god at any time, so that the hypothesis rests on two postulates, first, that the Hittites had such a god Arunas, and, second, that he was borrowed by the Indians. But the association of this god with Mitra is not explained by his sea character. Kretschmer[2] insists that the pair are a reflex of the Babylonian Sin and Šamaš, Moon and Sun. Šamaš, again, is symbolised by the sun

1 OLZ. 1921, p. 200.

2 WZKM. xxxiii. 16 f. Konow (*Festgabe Jacobi*, p. 262) holds that Mesopotamian influence developed, while not creating, the Aryan conception of the Asuras.

Digitized by Google

with rays and streams of water, or even by streams and fish, while a Hittite hymn, invoking the Sun to rise from the sea (*arunaz*), suggests the close connection of the ideas of the sun and the sea, which recurs in the Vedic idea of the sun rising from the water. Nor is this all. The Vedic Varuṇa is also the Asura, and the Iranian highest god is Ahura Mazdāh. Both gods have a special character, distinguishing them from normal Indo-European gods, and suggesting that they are an Aryan borrowing; Asura indeed is Aryan, "lord", or some kindred sense, but the god is Assur,[1] the parallel according to Jastrow of the old Babylonian heaven and sun god Anu. But all these speculations seem to lack any sure foundation.

---

1 Hommel (*Ethnologie und Geographie des alten Orients*, p. 219) derives Asuria direct from the Moon-god, Asur.

Digitized by Google